CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

This section of the research is intends to accomplish the objectives of the study by analyzing the variables and tests the hypotheses with the help of research design mentioned in chapter 3. The chapter covers interpretation of both quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Quantitative Analysis

Table 4

Comparison of Transformational leadership of school principals

Variables	Mean	Percentile	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
Transformational	**2.59**	**Fairly often**		**2.85**
Inspirational Motivation	2.87	44	Fairly often	2.92
Individualized Consideration	2.35	24	Sometimes	2.85
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.62	34	Fairly often	2.77
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.75	40	Fairly often	2.94
Intellectual Stimulation	2.38	25	Sometimes	2.78
Transactional	**2.11**	**Sometimes**		**1.86**
Management-by-Exception (active)	2.12	70	Sometimes	1.67
Contingent Reward	2.81	42	Fairly often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.4	75	Once in a while	1.03
Laissez Faire	**1.01**	**72**	**Once in a while**	**0.65**
Leadership Effectiveness	**3.03**	**Fairly often**		**3.07**

Table 5

Comparison of transformational leadership of principals as perceived by their teachers

Variables	Mean	Percentile	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
Transformational	**2.53**	**Fairly Often**		**2.85**
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.66	27	Fairly often	2.94
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.65	26	Fairly often	2.77
Inspirational Motivation	2.69	35	Fairly often	2.92
Intellectual Stimulation	2.25	20	Sometimes	2.78
Individualized Consideration	2.38	25	Sometimes	2.85
Transactional	**2.00**	**Sometimes**		**1.86**
Contingent Reward	2.47	29	Fairly often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (active)	2.00	55	Sometimes	1.67
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.54	80	Once in a while	1.03
Laissez Faire	**1.50**	**90**	**Once in a while**	**0.65**
Leadership Effectiveness	**2.72**	**Fairly Often**		**3.07**

MLQ Norms: Taken form (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Interpretation Score: 0-0.8 (Not at all); 0.81-1.6 (Once in a while); 1.61-2.4(Sometimes); 2.41-3.2 (Fairly often) ; 3.21-4(Frequently if not always)

Interpretation and Discussion

It is revealed through the responses of both principals and teachers compiled in Table 4 and Table 5 respectively, that transformational leadership is *fairly often* displayed by principals, while they *sometimes* display transactional and once in a while demonstrate laissez-faire leadership. The outcomes for transactional and transformational leadership practices are evaluated as per the lines of MLQ norm (Avolio & Bass, 2004), however, laissez-faire leadership was displayed more than norm by the leaders.

The results showed that among transformational leadership attributes, inspirational motivation earns maximum mean score (M=2.69) as rated by teachers and (M=2.87) from principals and got "fairly often" rank, in the principals which is as MLQ norm. These values of inspirational motivation demonstrated that the principals of the schools follow positive approach, motivate their teachers and encourage them for fulfillment of their responsibilities.

Idealized influence (attribute) gets the second highest mean value (M=2.66) and (M=2.75) as perceived by teachers and principals respectively. The values are as per the norms of MLQ. By using idealized influence attribute, the principals can pay attention to higher order ethics and ideals by being powerful and confident. This can be concluded that principals of schools fairly often act as ideal role model for making their teachers confident.

The third highest mean score of (M=2.65) by teachers and (M=2.62) by principals are attained by Idealized influence behavior with a "fairly often" frequency, which is as per the MLQ norm. This attribute is helpful in focusing on sense and worth of mission for

institutions. The results indicate that the principals fairly often discuss about the organizational standards and valuables visions with colleagues.

Furthermore, transformational leadership style had a positive effect on job satisfaction, performance, motivation and organizational commitment of teachers. The present study found three attributes of transformational leadership, i.e. idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation and idealized influence (attribute) as perceived by teachers. The transformational leadership's charismatic aspect has been represented by these attributes. This implies that principal of senior secondary schools of Haryana motivate teachers and work as role models for them. In developing countries, the socio-cultural characteristics have led to the emergence of charismatic leadership as the most appropriate leadership style for institutional leaders (Tuomo, 2006).

Although, principals exhibit the attributes of effective leader, however, these attributes are not displayed to the rating more than 3. Bass and Avolio (2003). Therefore, these principals can be added under the category of medium level of effective transformational leaders.

The other two transformational leadership characteristics, i.e. individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation depict comparatively lower scores. The means scores for individualized consideration as per the responses of teachers and principals are 2.38 and 2.35 respectively, whereas for intellectual stimulation, the mean scores are 2.25 (teachers' responses) and 2.38 (principals' responses). These values lie in lower frequency range – *"sometimes"*, in principals which is conflicting with the MLQ norm. The MLQ range for both of these attributes is expected to be "fairly often in the principals as per the norms". The lower than norm scores of individualized consideration and

intellectual stimulation indicates that the principals might have inadequate knowledge about these transformational leadership attributes. The conclusion can be drawn that principals in Mahendergarh of Haryana State needs improvement in dimensions of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation for improved environment, i.e. more effectiveness and better satisfaction levels. Among the attributes of transactional leadership, the highest mean score is earned by contingent reward, i.e. 2.47 according to teachers' responses and 2.81 from principals' viewpoint. This value lies in "fairly often" frequency range which is in as per MLQ criterion. This shows that the leaders of Indian schools fairly often recognize the needs of their staff and try their best to fulfill them through different rewards and compensations. Moreover, remunerations are offered for good performance as well.(Yadav and Kumar, 2019).The laissez-faire leadership behaviors are exhibited by Mahendergarh district school principals is more than the requirements for effective leadership. The most probable reason behind the employment of laissez-faire leadership practices higher than the norm is the insufficient knowledge about this particular leadership style. Hence, the hypothesis "There exist significance difference in the transformational leadership of school principals" get rejected.

Table 6

Comparison of transformational leadership of school principals as perceived by male and female teachers.

Variables	Mean (Male Teachers)	Interpretation	Mean (Female Teachers)	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
Transformational	**2.65**	**Fairly Often**	**2.42**	**Fairly Often**	**2.85**
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.76	Fairly Often	2.57	Fairly Often	2.94
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.8	Fairly Often	2.52	Fairly Often	2.77
Inspirational Motivation	2.79	Fairly often	2.61	Fairly often	2.92
Intellectual Stimulation	2.38	Sometimes	2.13	Sometimes	2.78
Individualized Consideration	2.52	Fairly Often	2.25	Sometimes	2.85
Transactional	**2.16**	**Sometimes**	**1.86**	**Sometimes**	**1.86**
Contingent Reward	2.64	Fairly Often	2.33	Fairly Often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (active)	2.15	Sometimes	1.84	Sometimes	1.67
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.69	Sometimes	1.42	Once in a while	1.03
Laissez Faire	**1.54**	Once in a while	**1.42**	**Once in a while**	**0.65**
Leadership Effectiveness	**3.2**	Fairly Often	**3.3**	Fairly Often	**3.07**

Table 7

Comparison of transformational leadership between male and female school principals

Variables	Mean (Male principals)	Interpretation	Mean (Female Principals)	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
Transformational	**2.64**	**Fairly Often**	**2.43**	**Fairly Often**	**2.85**
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.76	Fairly Often	2.43	Fairly Often	2.94
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.8	Fairly Often	2.09	Sometimes	2.77
Inspirational Motivation	2.79	Fairly often	2.98	Fairly often	2.92
Intellectual Stimulation	2.38	Sometimes	2.42	Fairly Often	2.78
Individualized Consideration	2.52	Sometimes	2.24	Sometimes	2.85
Transactional	**2.16**	**Sometimes**	**1.96**	**Sometimes**	**1.86**
Contingent Reward	2.64	Sometimes	2.57	Fairly Often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (active)	2.15	Sometimes	1.96	Sometimes	1.67
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.69	Once in a while	1.35	Once in a while	1.03
Laissez Faire	**1.54**	**Once in a while**	**0.96**	**Once in a while**	**0.65**
Leadership Effectiveness	**3.2**	Fairly Often	**2.90**	Fairly Often	**3.07**

MLQ Norms: Taken form (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Interpretation Score: 0-0.8 (Not at all); 0.81-1.6 (Once in a while); 1.61-2.4(Sometimes); 2.41-3.2 (Fairly often); 3.21-4(Frequently if not always)

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 7 depicts that the evaluation of responses that both male and female principals possessed reasonable level of transformational leadership characteristics. Whereas among principals of school in Haryana, male ones shows better idealized behavior (M=2.77) and idealized attribute (M=2.83) in comparison to the female principals who depicted mean values of 2.43 and 2.09 for idealized attribute and idealized behavior respectively. This indicates that male principals are more concerned about boosting the confidence level of their teachers and also talk about the standards and vision of the institute. However, female principals shows more intellectual stimulation (M=2.42) and inspirational motivation factor (M=2.98) compared to male principals mean scores.

Moreover, the transactional leadership attributes have been shown "sometimes" by both male and female principals. Overall male principals have been found to have better leadership effectiveness than the female principals in transactional attribute.

Table 6 and Table 7 exhibits that transformational leadership is *fairly often* displayed by both male and female principals, whereas the transactional leadership attributes are *sometimes* displayed by them. The mean values of transformational and transactional leadership attributes depicted by male and female principals of school in Haryana(Avolio & Bass, 2004) but the display of laissez-faire leadership should ideally be *not at all* which is *once in a while* here. Hence the null hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in the transformational leadership of male and female principals" not get rejected. In contrast   Xu, Wubbena, Stewart (2016) reported that female school principals have high traits of transformational leadership style while male school principals have high traits of transactional leadership style.

Table 8

Comparison of transformational leadership of principals as perceived by sciences and

humanities teachers

Variables	Science Department teachers	Interpretation	Humanities Department teachers	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
TL	**2.54**	**Fairly Often**	**2.52**	**Fairly Often**	**2.85**
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.66	Fairly Often	2.67	Fairly Often	2.94
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.66	Fairly Often	2.66	Fairly Often	2.77
Inspirational Motivation	2.74	Fairly Often	2.66	Fairly Often	2.92
Intellectual Stimulation	2.25	Sometimes	2.26	Sometimes	2.78
Individualized Consideration	2.41	Fairly Often	2.35	Sometimes	2.85
Transactional Leadership	**2.03**	**Sometimes**	**1.98**	**Sometimes**	**1.86**
Contingent Reward	2.54	Fairly Often	2.42	Fairly Often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (active)	1.97	Sometimes	2.02	Sometimes	1.67
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.60	Once in a while	1.51	Once in a while	1.03
Laissez Faire	**1.53**	**Once in awhile**	**1.44**	**Once in a while**	**0.65**
Leadership Effectiveness	**2.81**	**Fairly Often**	**2.80**	**Fairly Often**	**3.07**

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 8 depicts assessment of responses provided by teachers of science and humanities department highlighted that the attributes of transformational leadership are *fairly often* displayed by principals of schools in Haryana, while they *sometimes* display transactional.

Table depicts that the inspirational motivation has the maximum mean score (M=2.69) from science subject teachers while for humanities subject teachers the maximum mean score (M=2.67) is earned by Idealized Influence (attribute). So hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in the transformational leadership among principals as perceived by science and humanities teachers" Framed earlier is rejected.

The assessment is carried further by considering the impact of principal leadership styles over the teachers working in private and government sectors.

The responses from government and private schools of Haryana State, India are collected and interpreted in Table 9 and Table10 respectively (Yadav and Kumar, 2019).

Table 9

Comparison of transformational leadership of principals between government and

private schools

Variables	Private school principals	Interpretation	Government school Principals	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
Transformational	**2.54**	**Fairly Often**	**2.53**	**Fairly Often**	**2.85**
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.39	Fairly Often	2.87	Fairly Often	2.94
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.26	Fairly Often	2.59	Fairly Often	2.77
Inspirational Motivation	3.08	Fairly often	2.75	Fairly often	2.92
Intellectual Stimulation	2.45	Sometimes	2.35	Sometimes	2.78
Individualized Consideration	2.50	Sometimes	2.11	Sometimes	2.85
Transactional	**2.16**	**Sometimes**	**2.14**	**Sometimes**	**1.86**
Contingent Reward	2.50	Fairly Often	2.80	Fairly Often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (active)	2.64	Sometimes	2.16	Sometimes	1.67
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.96	Sometimes	1.47	Once in a while	1.03
Laissez Faire	**0.88**	**Once in a while**	**1.11**	**Once in a while**	**0.65**
Leadership Effectiveness	**2.93**	Fairly Often	**2.89**	Fairly Often	**3.07**

Table 10

Comparison of transformational leadership of principals as perceived by private and

government teachers.

Variables	Private school Teachers	Interpretation	Government school teachers	Interpretation	MLQ Norms
Transformational	**2.46**	**Fairly Often**	**2.61**	**Fairly Often**	**2.85**
Idealized Influence (attribute)	2.52	Fairly Often	2.81	Sometimes	2.94
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.56	Fairly Often	2.76	Sometimes	2.77
Inspirational Motivation	2.62	Fairly often	2.79	Fairly often	2.92
Intellectual Stimulation	2.21	Sometimes	2.30	Fairly Often	2.78
Individualized Consideration	2.37	Sometimes	2.39	Fairly Often	2.85
Transactional	1.89	Sometimes	2.12	Sometimes	1.86
Contingent Reward	2.39	Sometimes	2.57	Fairly Often	2.87
Management-by-Exception (active)	1.89	Sometimes	2.09	Fairly Often	1.67
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.39	Once in a while	1.71	Sometimes	1.03
Laissez Faire	1.60	Once in a while	1.37	Once in a while	0.65
Leadership Effectiveness	2.76	Fairly Often	2.86	Fairly Often	3.07

Interpretation and Discussion

From table 9 &10 it is observed that private school principals have high inspirational motivation (M=3.08) than the government schools (M=2.75) and shows improved individualized consideration (M=2.50). This indicates that private school principals in Haryana spend more time in coaching and training their principals also motivate followers and help them in developing their strengths.

On the other hand, the government school principals depicts higher values of idealized influence attributes (M=2.87) and idealized influence behavior (M=2.59). This shows that government school principals inculcate pride in those that are linked to them and build respect among teachers. Moreover, they emphasize on the significance of having a collective goal or mission. However, according to the assessment, the government principals demonstrated Laissez-Faire leadership qualities more compared to private schools, i.e. M=0.88 for private school and M=1.11 for government ones. It indicates that principals of government schools of Haryana are not available to their teachers when particularly needed and do not give in time response to urgent issues. After analysis hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in the transformational leadership of government and private school principals is not rejected. Teachers of government schools believes that their principals help them in directing their attention towards mistakes and allow them to take decisions on their own, which boosts their confidence and makes working environment productive (Yadav and Kumar, 2019).

The results reveals that out of nine major attributes, idealized influence attribute, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence behavior and contingent rewards made significant contribution as predictors towards the leadership effectiveness.

Bentley (2011) found moderate differences among the demographic variables like gender, ethnicity, school level etc. However, the study found no differences between the leadership styles and the years of experience for principals.

Table 11

Comparison of job satisfaction between male and female school teachers

Mann-Whitney U Test Statistics of Factors and Total Score (Gender)

Test	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Mann – Whitney U	13850.00	18785.0	18260.000	9159.500	14058.000	9538.000	19390.500	18026.500	17335.500
Wilcox on W	33950.000	38885.000	38360.000	29950.000	34158.000	29638.000	39490.500	39126.500	37435.500
Z.	-5.349	-1.076	-1.512	-9.420	-5.159	-9.176	-.530	-1.724	-2.30
Asymp.sig (2 tailed)	.000	.282	.131	.000	.000	.000	.596	.085	.021

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 11 depicts Satisfaction in respect to the institutional plans and policies of the school and satisfaction with authorities is statistically significantly higher among male teachers in comparison to female teachers. But satisfaction from the social status and family welfare is higher among female teachers in comparison to male teachers. On the other hand there is no statistically significant difference in the satisfaction scores in the factors rapport with students and relationship with co-workers in the male and female school teachers. Furthermore, if we see the total score, it can be noted that female

teachers have lower job satisfaction than their male counterparts. Accordingly the null hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in the job satisfaction of male and female school teachers" is rejected. This is on contrary to the previous findings of Qamar, Ahmad and Imam (2015) which results describe no significant difference in the job satisfaction of teachers. (Yadav and Kumar, 2019).

Table 12

Comparison of job satisfaction between private and government school teachers

Mann-Whitney U Test Statistics of Factors and Total Score (school type)

Test	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Mann – Whitney U	7979.500	15326.000	.000	7049.500	6831.500	14800.000	13845.000	2371.000	105.000
Wilcoxon W	28079.500	35426.000	20100.000	27149.500	26931.500	34900.000	33945.000	22471.000	20205.000
Z.	-10.456	-4.139	-17.377	-11.254	-11.434	-4.561	-5.354	-15.396	-17.212
Asymp. sig (2 tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Interpretation and Discussion

The table 12 results highlight that government school teachers are less satisfied than the private school teachers, when it comes to the intrinsic factors of the job. However, in case of factors like satisfaction with social status and family welfare and rapport with students is higher among government school teachers than private school teachers. Moreover, relationship with co-workers is statistically significantly higher in private school teachers. Hence null hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in

121

the job satisfaction of government and private school teachers" is not accepted. The results of present study is in contradiction to the study conducted by Mitra (2018) which reveals that private school teachers are less satisfied in their jobs than government school teachers .

Table 13

Comparison of job satisfaction between humanities and science school teachers

Mann-Whitney U Test Statistics of Factors and Total Score (stream type**)**

Test	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Mann – Whitney U	19129 .000	17170. 500	14130. 000	16236. 000	16706. 500	15995 .00	19471. 000	19092. 000	19451. 000
Wilcox on W	39229 .000	32270. 000	34230. 000	36336. 000	36806. 500	36095 .000	39571. 500	38192. 000	39551. 000
Z.	-.758	-2.506	-5.100	-3.271	-2.860	- 3.513	-.460	-1.666	-.475
Asymp.sig (2 tailed)	.449	.012	.000	.000	.004	.000	.646	.096	.635

Interpretation and Discussion

The table 13 results indicate that social science school teachers have lower satisfaction level related to salary, promotional avenues and service conditions, satisfaction with authorities and satisfaction with social status and family welfare, than humanities teachers. The teachers from humanities stream are more satisfied in terms of physical facilities of school, satisfaction pertaining to institutional plans and policies than the

sciences teachers. The results also indicate that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction in humanities and sciences teachers in factors like intrinsic aspects of the job. Hence null hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in the job satisfaction of humanities and science school teachers" is not rejected.

The results are in contradiction to the study conducted by Shukla (2015) that states social science stream's teachers have less job satisfaction than the science stream's teachers has. Dey, Pakira and Mohakud (2016) evaluated social science and Science stream school teacher have no significant difference in the job satisfaction.

Table 14

Comparison of transformational leadership effect on job satisfaction of the teachers

Linear Regression

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	194.018	6.445		30.105	.000
	IA	-1.283	1.943	-.039	-.660	.509
	IB	-.427	2.163	-.012	-.197	.844
	IM	1.107	1.996	.032	.555	.580
	IS	-1.964	1.752	-.062	-1.121	.263
	IC	-.238	1.706	-.007	-.139	.889

a. Dependent Variable: Total Score

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 14 shows Linear Regression analysis is done to define the role of transformational leadership style on job satisfaction of the teachers. While total scores for the job satisfaction were dependent variable and the transformational leadership scales are

taken as independent variables. From the Table above it can be seen that with p-value > 0.05 the results are statistically insignificant. This further infers that transformational leadership attributes of principals are not statistically significant predictor for the job satisfaction of the school teachers. Hence, the null hypothesis "There exists no significant effect of transformational leadership of principals on job satisfaction of school teachers is not rejected.

On the contrary to these results, Zacharo, Marios and Dimitra (2018) reported that secondary junior and high schools teachers of Greece have significant relation with the transformational leadership traits of their principals and job satisfaction, Irrespective of the type of school and experience of the teachers. Moreover, Tesfaw (2014) conducted a study in Ethiopian government secondary school and concluded moderate, and significant relation transformational leadership style of principals and job satisfaction of teachers.

Table 15

Comparison of job performance between male and female school teachers

Descriptive Job Performance and Gender		N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Discipline and Regularity	Male	200	3.5300	.92920	.06570	3.4004	3.6596	2.00	5.00
	Female	200	3.5200	.85631	.06055	3.4006	3.6394	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.5250	.89239	.04462	3.4373	3.6127	2.00	5.00
Management Skills	Male	200	3.1434	1.50995	.10677	2.9328	3.3539	1.00	5.00
	Female	200	3.5666	1.27028	.08982	3.3895	3.7438	1.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.3550	1.40954	.07048	3.2164	3.4936	1.00	5.00
Professional Knowledge	Male	200	3.5670	.63556	.04494	3.4784	3.6556	2.00	5.00
	Female	200	3.6590	.62407	.04413	3.5720	3.7460	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.6130	.63073	.03154	3.5510	3.6750	2.00	5.00
Instructional Delivery	Male	200	4.1503	.57750	.04084	4.0698	4.2308	2.00	5.00
	Female	200	4.1687	.57706	.04080	4.0882	4.2492	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1595	.57663	.02883	4.1028	4.2162	2.00	5.00
Learning environment	Male	200	4.0600	.55943	.03956	3.9820	4.1380	2.50	5.00
	Female	200	4.0812	.51786	.03662	4.0090	4.1535	2.50	5.00
	Total	400	4.0706	.53848	.02692	4.0177	4.1236	2.50	5.00
Effective Communication	Male	200	4.1780	.52516	.03713	4.1048	4.2512	2.67	5.00
	Female	200	4.0668	.69448	.04911	3.9700	4.1637	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1224	.61741	.03087	4.0617	4.1831	2.00	5.00
Professionalism and commitment	Male	200	4.1368	.56738	.04012	4.0577	4.2159	2.67	5.00
	Female	200	4.1305	.62233	.04401	4.0437	4.2173	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1336	.59475	.02974	4.0752	4.1921	2.00	5.00

Table 16

Comparison of job performance between male and female school teachers

Gender and Job Performance ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discipline and Regularity	Between Groups	.010	1	.010	.013	.911
	Within Groups	317.740	398	.798		
	Total	317.750	399			
Management Skills	Between Groups	17.918	1	17.918	9.204	.003
	Within Groups	774.821	398	1.947		
	Total	792.739	399			
Professional Knowledge	Between Groups	.846	1	.846	2.134	.145
	Within Groups	157.886	398	.397		
	Total	158.732	399			
Instructional Delivery	Between Groups	.034	1	.034	.102	.750
	Within Groups	132.636	398	.333		
	Total	132.670	399			
Learning environment	Between Groups	.045	1	.045	.155	.694
	Within Groups	115.647	398	.291		
	Total	115.692	399			
Effective Communication	Between Groups	1.235	1	1.235	3.259	.072
	Within Groups	150.862	398	.379		
	Total	152.097	399			
Professionalism and commitment	Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.011	.916
	Within Groups	141.132	398	.355		
	Total	141.136	399			

Interpretation and Discussion

The table 15 and 16 results state that out of 7 factors of job performance. The factors like discipline and regularity, professional knowledge, instructional delivery, learning environment, effective communication, and professionalism and commitment, there was no significant difference in the performance of both the genders.

The study highlights that for 64% of the male teachers, their principals mention that they are disciplined and punctual while for 55% of the female teachers, principals mention the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between discipline/punctuality of male and female teachers. Male teachers are likely to be more disciplined and punctual than their female counterparts. For 58.5% of the male teachers, their principals mentioned that they rarely take leave while for 67% of the female teachers, principals mentioned the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between the attendance of male and female teachers. Female teachers are likely to be more regular than their male peers. This is again strengthened with p-value 0.011, for 67% of the female teachers, principals acknowledged that they rarely take leave on contrary to the male teachers with 58.5%.so the null hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in job performance level of Male and a female school teacher "is rejected.

A number of researches that have been run in the past indicate that there is a difference in the behavior of the male and female teachers in the classroom (Laird, 2007). Whilst, various studies have also found that students have different reactions with regard to how their teachers' behave in the classroom (Basow, 1998; Zivkovic et al. 2012; Whitworth, Price and Randall, 2002). Also, other studies have found that while male

teachers bound to spend most of their time in the class lecturing, the female faculty tries to engage the students in an active way to grasp knowledge. These methods are known as learner-centered instructional practices (Brawner et al, 2001; Lammers and Murphy, 2002; Starbuck, 2003; Laird, Garver, Niskode, 2007). The said research stipulates that gender causes a disparity in various circumstances.

In the past few years, a lot of studies have been carried out to examine the relationship that exists between teachers' effectiveness and their gender. The results that have been put across are mixed. Various reports have surfaced which conflict the findings of this study. Jayaramanna, 2001; Kagathala, 2002; Vijayalakshmi, 2002; Mohanty and Parida, 2010; Singh et al, 2012; Baraiya and Baraiya, 2013 found that gender has no role to play, whatsoever, when it comes to the effectiveness of teachers.

Nonetheless, there are some researchers who have come across the fact that the gender of the teacher to be an important parameter in predicting the effectiveness. According to the results, females are said to be more effective in terms of teaching as compare to their male contemporaries. (Agrawal, 2003; Arokiadoss, 2005; Mahanta, 2012; Luschei, 2012). In contrast to this, Kulkarni (2000) found that male teachers were more effective and females were rated to average as far as teaching was concerned. (Kumar, 2019).

Table 17

Comparison of job performance between government and private school teachers

Descriptive Job Performance and Type of School		N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Discipline and Regularity	Government	200	2.9100	.72424	.05121	2.8090	3.0110	2.00	5.00
	Private	200	4.1400	.55853	.03949	4.0621	4.2179	3.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.5250	.89239	.04462	3.4373	3.6127	2.00	5.00
Management Skills	Government	200	3.0434	1.51542	.10716	2.8320	3.2547	1.00	5.00
	Private	200	3.6666	1.22143	.08637	3.4963	3.8370	1.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.3550	1.40954	.07048	3.2164	3.4936	1.00	5.00
Professional Knowledge	Government	200	3.6140	.67176	.04750	3.5203	3.7077	2.00	5.00
	Private	200	3.6120	.58855	.04162	3.5299	3.6941	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.6130	.63073	.03154	3.5510	3.6750	2.00	5.00
Instructional Delivery	Government	200	4.1519	.55910	.03953	4.0739	4.2298	2.00	5.00
	Private	200	4.1671	.59496	.04207	4.0842	4.2501	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1595	.57663	.02883	4.1028	4.2162	2.00	5.00
Learning environment	Government	200	3.9875	.56641	.04005	3.9085	4.0665	2.50	5.00
	Private	200	4.1538	.49665	.03512	4.0845	4.2230	2.50	5.00
	Total	400	4.0706	.53848	.02692	4.0177	4.1236	2.50	5.00
Effective Communication	Government	200	4.1250	.64667	.04573	4.0348	4.2151	2.00	5.00
	Private	200	4.1199	.58831	.04160	4.0379	4.2019	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1224	.61741	.03087	4.0617	4.1831	2.00	5.00
Professionalism and commitment	Government	200	4.0919	.60149	.04253	4.0081	4.1758	2.00	5.00
	Private	200	4.1753	.58646	.04147	4.0936	4.2571	2.67	5.00
	Total	400	4.1336	.59475	.02974	4.0752	4.1921	2.00	5.00

Table 18

Comparison of job performance between government and private school teachers

School Type and Job Performance ANOVA		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discipline and Regularity	Between Groups	151.290	1	151.290	361.729	.000
	Within Groups	166.460	398	.418		
	Total	317.750	399			
Management Skills	Between Groups	38.850	1	38.850	20.510	.000
	Within Groups	753.889	398	1.894		
	Total	792.739	399			
Professional Knowledge	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.001	.975
	Within Groups	158.732	398	.399		
	Total	158.732	399			
Instructional Delivery	Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.070	.791
	Within Groups	132.646	398	.333		
	Total	132.670	399			
Learning environment	Between Groups	2.764	1	2.764	9.741	.002
	Within Groups	112.928	398	.284		
	Total	115.692	399			
Effective Communication	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.007	.935
	Within Groups	152.095	398	.382		
	Total	152.097	399			
Professionalism and commitment	Between Groups	.696	1	.696	1.971	.161
	Within Groups	140.441	398	.353		
	Total	141.136	399			

Interpretation and Discussion

The table 17 and 18 results exhibit that there is statistically significant difference in the discipline and regularity, management skills and learning environment provided by the private and public school teachers. For some factors, private school teachers perform better than the government school teachers, while on a few factors government school teachers outperform. However, overall, as per the mean scores and results of ANOVA it can be seen that private school teachers perform better in discipline and punctuality, have better management skills and provide better learning environment than government school teachers.

The study found that for 83% of the government school teachers, it is mention that they are not disciplined and punctual while for 100% of the private school teachers, principals mention the opposite, i.e. 100% of the private school teachers are punctual and disciplined. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between discipline/punctuality of private and government school teachers. The private school teachers are likely to be more disciplined and punctual than the government school teachers. Likewise, for 78% of the government school teachers, it is mention that they do not grade the tests and assignments in a timely manner while for 86.5% of the private school teachers, principals mention the opposite i.e. 86.5% of the private school timely assess the tests and assignments. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between the time for assessment taken by the teachers of private and government school. The private school teachers are likely to be more on time when it comes to assessment than the government school teachers.

On account of attendance for 53% of the government school teachers, it is mention that they rarely take leave while for 73% of the private school teachers, principals mentioned the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between the attendance of private and government school teachers. Private school teachers are likely to be more regular than the government peers.

Moreover, for 56% of the government school teachers, their principals mention that they respond to misbehavior in highly effective and sensitive manner while for 76% of the private school teachers, principals mention the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between response to misbehavior from private and government school teachers. Private school teachers are likely to be more effective and sensitive in responding to misbehavior.

Regarding documentation, for 53% of the government school teachers, their principals mention that they record the performance of each student around the year while for 72.5% of the private school teachers, principals mention the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between the process and time of documentation of the students' progress by private and government school teachers. The private teachers are likely to have better management skills than the government school teachers when it comes to documentation of the students' progress.

Regarding the performance for 85.7% of the government school teachers, their principals mentioned that their work results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate academic progress of the students while for 72.5% of the private school teachers, principals mentioned the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between type of school and acceptable or measurable academic

progress of the students. The work of government school teachers is likely to be more result-oriented than the private school teachers. Regarding the learning environment around 72% of the government school teachers, their principals mentioned that they maximize instructional learning time by working with students individually or in teams while for 92.5% of the private school teachers, principals mention the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant difference between the instructional learning approach of private and government school teachers. Higher number of private school teachers is likely to demonstrate instructional learning approach than the government school teachers. Hence null hypothesis "There exists no significant difference in job performance of government and private school teachers" is rejected.

Olasehinde and Olatoye (2014) in their study conducted in Nigeria concluded that private school teachers are more effective than the government school teachers. There can be various reasons which could explain this phenomena and it includes small class size, the cleanliness at private schools and the welcoming nature which the teachers are exposed to in private schools. Whilst, in a public school it can be clearly observed that the teachers have a negative attitude towards teaching. Igbinedion and Epumepu (2011) had the similar findings in the field of business studies. Lassibille and Tan (2010) conducted a study with regard to the efficiency of private schools as compared to public ones. The simulations of the study indicate that private schools are less efficient than public schools. However, this finding differed from the results that were obtained in Tanzania. On the other hand, a study carried out by Sumra and Katabaro (2014) about the declining quality of education in Tanzania concluded on the lines that a factor which was contributing to the failure rate of education was the incessant establishment of community schools in the region

Table 19

Comparison of job performance between humanities and science school teachers

Descriptives Stream and job performance		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Discipline and Regularity	Science	200	3.5550	.93882	.06638	3.4241	3.6859	2.00	5.00
	Humanities	200	3.4950	.84471	.05973	3.3772	3.6128	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.5250	.89239	.04462	3.4373	3.6127	2.00	5.00
Management Skills	Science	200	3.5000	1.40914	.09964	3.3035	3.6965	1.00	5.00
	Humanities	200	3.2100	1.39846	.09889	3.0150	3.4050	1.00	5.00
	Total	400	3.3550	1.40954	.07048	3.2164	3.4936	1.00	5.00
Professional Knowledge	Science	200	3.6050	.66512	.04703	3.5123	3.6977	2.00	5.00
	Humanities	200	3.6210	.59593	.04214	3.5379	3.7041	2.20	5.00
	Total	400	3.6130	.63073	.03154	3.5510	3.6750	2.00	5.00
Instructional Delivery	Science	200	4.1523	.55600	.03932	4.0748	4.2298	2.67	5.00
	Humanities	200	4.1667	.59786	.04228	4.0833	4.2501	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1595	.57663	.02883	4.1028	4.2162	2.00	5.00
Learning environment	Science	200	4.0288	.53471	.03781	3.9542	4.1033	2.50	5.00
	Humanities	200	4.1125	.54030	.03821	4.0372	4.1878	2.50	5.00
	Total	400	4.0706	.53848	.02692	4.0177	4.1236	2.50	5.00
Effective Communication	Science	200	4.0681	.65151	.04607	3.9773	4.1590	2.00	5.00
	Humanities	200	4.1767	.57786	.04086	4.0961	4.2573	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1224	.61741	.03087	4.0617	4.1831	2.00	5.00
Professionalism and commitment	Science	200	4.1835	.55929	.03955	4.1056	4.2615	2.00	5.00
	Humanities	200	4.0837	.62563	.04424	3.9965	4.1710	2.00	5.00
	Total	400	4.1336	.59475	.02974	4.0752	4.1921	2.00	5.00

Table 20

Comparison of job performance between humanities and science school teachers

Streams and Job Performance ANOVA		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Discipline and Regularity	Between Groups	.360	1	.360	.451	.502
	Within Groups	317.390	398	.797		
	Total	317.750	399			
Management Skills	Between Groups	8.410	1	8.410	4.268	.039
	Within Groups	784.329	398	1.971		
	Total	792.739	399			
Professional Knowledge	Between Groups	.026	1	.026	.064	.800
	Within Groups	158.707	398	.399		
	Total	158.732	399			
Instructional Delivery	Between Groups	.021	1	.021	.062	.803
	Within Groups	132.649	398	.333		
	Total	132.670	399			
Learning environment	Between Groups	.701	1	.701	2.428	.120
	Within Groups	114.991	398	.289		
	Total	115.692	399			
Effective Communication	Between Groups	1.178	1	1.178	3.107	.079
	Within Groups	150.919	398	.379		
	Total	152.097	399			
Professionalism and commitment	Between Groups	.996	1	.996	2.829	.093
	Within Groups	140.140	398	.352		
	Total	141.136	399			

Interpretation and Discussion

The table 19 and 20 results demonstrate statistically significant difference in the management skills of teachers from science and humanities' stream. The mean score state that science school teachers are better in management skills than the teachers from the humanities stream.

For 70.5% of the science school teachers, their principals mentioned that they respond to misbehavior in highly effective and sensitive manner while for 61.5% of the humanities school teachers, principals mention the same. Teachers from science stream are likely to be more effective and sensitive in responding to misbehavior than the teachers from humanities. Regarding documentation, for 65.5% of the science school teachers, their principal's mention that they document the progress of each student throughout the year while for 60% of the humanities school teachers, principals mentioned the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant association between stream and documentation of the students' progress. The teachers from science stream are likely to have better management skills than the teachers from humanities stream when it comes to documentation of the students' progress. Regarding the performance for 65.5% of the science school teachers, their principals mention that their work results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate academic progress of the students while for 60% of the private school teachers principals, mention the same. With p-value < 0.05 it can be said that there is statistically significant association between stream and acceptable or measurable academic progress of the students. The work of school teachers from science stream is likely to be more result-oriented than the humanities' school teachers. The hypothesis "There exists no

significant difference in job performance of humanities and science school teachers" is

rejected.

Table 21

Comparison of effect of transformational leadership of principals on job performance of

school teachers

Correlation transformational leadership and Job Performance of teachers (p-values)					
Statements	IA	IB	IM	IS	IC
The teacher is disciplined and punctual	0.174	0.075	0.975	0.960	0.619
He/She grades the tests and assignments in a timely manner	0.347	0.406	0.629	0.237	0.257
He/She is always decently and neatly dressed	0.551	0.155	0.728	0.846	0.920
He/She rarely takes leave from school	0.658	0.060	0.392	**0.020**	0.432
He/She responds to misbehavior in highly effective and sensitive manner.	0.662	**0.018**	0.258	**0.013**	0.717
He/She records the performance of each student around the year.	0.658	0.060	0.392	**0.020**	0.432
His/Her works leads to fair and appropriate academic performance of the student.	0.678	0.059	0.374	**0.018**	0.427
He/She effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.	0.852	0.550	0.729	0.187	0.322
He/She links theory with practical learning experiences, real world applications and other subjects.	0.950	0.211	0.515	0.094	0.696
He/She has rich and comprehensive knowledge of the subject.	0.913	0.090	0.854	0.833	0.285
He/She has good communication and follows up with students for checking.	0.781	0.985	0.426	0.852	0.738
He/She has an understanding related to social, emotional, and physical development of the	0.576	0.735	0.617	0.571	0.953

students' age group.					
He/She motivates students to participate in active learning.	0.552	0.223	0.843	0.848	0.103
He/She uses a number of instructional methods and resources that are effective in learning.	0.496	0.940	0.650	0.114	0.195
He/She make use of technology to boost the student learning.	0.539	0.908	0.552	0.595	0.553
He/She adheres to the differences in language, culture, gender of the students.	0.645	0.649	0.406	0.367	0.078
He/She actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.	0.187	0.251	0.037	0.899	0.849
He/ She maintain an environment of trust and teamwork being just, empathetic, respectful, and passionate.	0.547	0.323	0.678	0.366	0.214
He/She regularly and effectively communicates with parents/guardians and thereby maintains healthy relationship with them.	0.897	0.530	0.618	0.204	**0.013**
He/She communicates and cooperates adequately.	0.494	0.394	0.813	0.921	0.069
He/She genuinely care and respect students and express that through eye contact, pitch, and tone and, body language.	0.459	0.142	0.057	0.582	0.756
He/She is positive towards the teaching profession.	0.283	0.165	0.252	0.957	0.847
He/She exhibits professional growth through participation and experimentation in professional activities.	0.755	0.292	0.190	0.702	0.461
He/ She cooperate and collaborate with other staff and students to maintain a good relationship.	0.078	0.181	0.211	0.216	0.921
He/ She maximizes the learning time by giving attention to the students individually and in groups	0.585	0.964	0.718	**0.029**	0.783

Interpretation and Discussion

The table 21 highlights that idealized attribute and inspirational motivation aspects of transformational leadership in principals have no statistically significant relation with any factor of the job performance. It is further found that idealized behavior of principals is positively correlated with the responsiveness of the teachers to the misbehavior in highly effective and sensitive manner. This refers that principals who show higher level of idealized behavior that includes need for change, developing vision for the future and encouraging followers to achieve results beyond expectations are more responsive in handling misbehavior in the class, sensitively and effectively.

Regarding intellectual stimulation, it is observed that there is statistically positive correlation with punctuality and discipline of teachers, documentation and management skills of teachers, result orientation of the teachers, and teamwork by collaborating with students. This refers that principals who encourages creativity and innovation, motivates critical thinking and problem solving tend to have highly effective, disciplined, punctual and committed followers. Also, individualized consideration in principals has statistically significant relation with the quality of teachers in maintaining healthy relationships with parents/guardians through timely and effective communication. This implies that principals who act as mentor and coach to the teachers by listening to them and having effective communication tend to transfer the same quality to their followers. Thus, the teachers under the leadership of principals having this quality tend to have effective communication with guardians and parents through regular and effective communication.

Table 22

Comparison of effect of transformational leadership of school principals on job

performance of the school teachers

	Multiple Linear Regression						
	Coefficients[a]						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95% Confidence Interval for B	
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	3.372	.200		16.820	.000	2.976	3.768
	IA	2.427E-6	.053	.000	.000	1.000	-.105	.105
	IB	.079	.062	.111	1.265	.208	-.044	.202
	Inspirational	-.024	.054	-.038	-.441	.660	-.132	.084
	IS	.136	.056	.197	2.434	.016	.026	.246
	IC	-.011	.057	-.017	-.194	.847	-.123	.101
a. Dependent Variable								

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 22 Linear Regression analysis is used to define the role of transformational leadership on job performance of the teachers. While the job performance of the teachers is dependent variable and the transformational leadership scales. The results are statistically insignificant except the Intellectual Stimulation. This further infers that transformational leadership attributes of principals are not statistically significant predictor for the job performance of the school teachers, except principals who encourages innovation, critical thinking and creativity can significantly predict the job performance of his/her teachers. Likewise, Leh, Sheik and Kanesan (2016) in their research conducted to study the relation between transformational leadership style and creativity amongst teachers. Hence hypothesis "There exists no significant effect of the transformational leadership of principals on job performance of the school teachers" is rejected .The results are in line with the findings of studies conducted, globally. Munawaroh (2011) state, that transformational leadership has some effect on the job performance of the teachers.

Qualitative analysis

The structured interviews were conducted with school principals. The structured interview was consisting of 25 questions regarding their leadership style. Along with interview the researcher also performed participant observation. The transcripts were prepared on the basis of interviews. However, only those principals were interviewed whose score in MLQ questionnaire were found to be high. As the prime objective of qualitative analysis was to explore the challenges faced by principals who showed

transformational leadership. Initial and focused coding was performed on transcripts of

interviews to find out factors and theme of transformational leadership.

Table 23

Thematic analysis of interviews

Initial coding	Focus coding	Freque ncy (N=20)	Sub theme	Theme
Treating employees like family, remove fear, support, Motivate, Praise, consistent boost, morale, empower, expectations.	Inspiration and Encouragement	20	Inspirational motivation (1)	Transformatio nal leadership
Professional development, Import training.	Sense of Purpose	18	Idealized Influence Attribute (2)	Transformatio nal leadership
Respect, Share views, accepts suggestions, each member can apply their thinking, willful listening.	New ideas adaptability	18	Intellectual Stimulation (3)	Transformatio nal leadership
Don't take mistakes negatively, Assess the depth of situation created, play role as a leader to improve in the teachers.	Immediate corrective measures	19	Management by Exception, Active (4)	Transactional leadership
Make successful efforts; provide assistance, equipment, guidelines books, Provide best subject matter, and better infrastructure.	Organizational Consciousness and Proactive Organizational Consciousness	17	Individualized Consideration (5)	Transformatio nal

Rewarded for their extra efforts. The rewarded may be extended in the forms of money on honor

Recognize the reward for success. | Extrinsic motivation | 12 | Contingent Reward (6) | Transactional leadership |
| Establish goals and communicate the expectations | Clear Communication, Visionary | 11 | Idealized influence Behavior (7) | Transformational leadership |
| Appreciate them personally, direct, communication, proper manner, proper learning and knowledge. | Attention to one-to-one communication | 12 | Individualized Consideration (8) | Transformational leadership |
| Role model, motivate support, Giving selfless favor, positive examples, respect, appreciate efforts. | Role model and Self-management | 12 | Idealized Influence Attribute and Inspirational Motivation (9) | Transformational

Idealized Influence Attribute and Inspirational Motivation |
| "Teamwork, work well together, trying their best in the circumstances. | Collaborating with team | 16 | Idealized Influence Behavior (10) | Transformational |
| Connection with society and parents. Motivate parents, right advice to students.

Cooperative, proper feedback to teachers | Cooperative and Balanced | 16 | Idealized Influence Behavior (11) | Transformational

Idealized Influence Behavior |

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 23 is formed using the themes that emerged from the interview responses. It also highlights the quotes referring to the particular themes and interpretation of the leadership style.

Theme 1: Transformational leadership

This theme includes sub-theme like inspirational motivation, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, idealized influence attribute and inspirational motivation and Idealized influence behavior.

Sub Themes1:Inspirational motivation

All the 20 principals exhibit behavior of Inspirational motivation as they focus on motivating their team and teachers. The principals acknowledged that time-to-time motivation results in attainment of full potential as employees are willing to perform and give their 100% when they are motivated. A few principals responded that they work selflessly, which is like setting a good and positive example for the team members, instead of verbally asking them to make to excel. As one government principal said *"I treat my teachers like a family and motivate them time to time".* And one female principal describe "I make cooperative environment for my team".

Sub Theme 2: Idealized influence (Attribute)

Responses of 18 out of 20 principals reflect that professional development of teachers is of utmost importance to them. Professional development helps teachers to perform more effectively and efficiently. Also, training and development extends the scope of learning which in result enhance their job satisfaction. Some principals focus on *"I provide technological help and inspire them to develop positive attitude towards new techniques".* These responses exhibit the Idealized Influence Attribute of transformational leadership.

Sub Theme 3: Intellectual stimulation

Moreover, 18 out of 20 principals stated that they encourage teachers to share their views and ideas. Most of these principals acknowledged that they appreciate in public and criticize in private. A principal described *"I praise my teachers in front of management"*. This reflects Intellectual Stimulation attribute to transformational leadership. The principals acknowledge that teaching is a very respectful profession. While each human deserves respect, teacher is looked up to and admired by parents, students and society as a whole and thus, their respect and honor should always be safeguarded, only then they can be satisfied with their role and perform as per expectations. For the same, 90% of the principals stated that take great care of their team's honor and empowerment.

Sub Theme 5 and 8: Individual consideration

While 17 out of 20 principals acknowledge that they provide assistance in terms of knowledge, guidance, resources and equipment to their team. Around 60% of the principals acknowledged the importance of individual attention and communication. The responses state that individual assessment of strengths and weaknesses of each team members help them in achieving objectives in an effective manner. One principal stated *"I appreciate my teachers and provide positive environment"*. These responses reflect Individualized Consideration aspect of transformational leadership. The principals stated that individual assessment and individual attention help teachers feel important part of the institute. This is return give them sense of responsibility.

Sub Theme 9: idealized influence attribute and inspirational motivation

Around 60% of the principals also acknowledge that they endeavor to be role model for their team and set good example by acting rather than preaching. This again, exhibits

Idealized Influence Attribute of the principals. The principals also acknowledge that when they work along with the team and follow the same standards instead of behaving as a boss, the performance of the team and work environment of the school is positively affected. One of the principal tells *"my team is a group of players so I provide a competitive environment to them"*. The teachers in such environment tend to push their limits and deliver beyond expectations. Also, healthy, friendly and peaceful work environment increases the security and satisfaction level of the teachers.

Sub Theme 7, 10 and 11: Idealized influence behavior

Idealized influence behavior of the principals is reflected when they acknowledge importance of team, team spirit, social connection, clear communication of objectives and attainment of full potential by making most of their knowledge. The respondents acknowledged that such initiatives by the principals help them maximize their output while healthy team spirit, utilization of knowledge and skills and clear and just communication not just help them perform effectively but give them sense of satisfaction in their work. One principal communicates that *"I give proper feedback to my teachers and I update my knowledge regularly and work hard"*.

Theme 2: Transactional Leadership

Sub Theme 4: Management by exception active

Out of 20, 19 principals, acknowledge that they help and provide feedback to their team members at a time of any problem and execution of the solution. Few principals *believe*

"I provide advice to teachers only the needed and provide support in exchange of their efforts".

Sub Theme 6: Transactional Reward

Contingent Rewards dimension is reflected when 60% of the principals acknowledge importance of monetary rewards like incentives, increment etc and non-monetary rewards like recognition in order to motivate the team members. Few principals' belief that *"I set the vision for the team members and give awards for their efforts".* Evidences point that association of transactional leadership has negative impact on job satisfaction (Nazim, 2016).

While the results of qualitative analysis are contradictory to the findings of quantitative analysis but these are in line with the previous studies. Many studies state that role of transformational leader is to guide and motivate the team members to execute (Zhu et.al. 2012; Rosenbach, 2018; and Northouse, 2018) thereby inspiring them to exceed the expectations (Doucet et. al., 2015). The responses in the interview also brought into the picture where it is seen that in some stances principals tend to subconsciously use mix of leadership style. For example- when asked how they motivate their team in worst of situation, principal stated: *"I hold myself accountable to the same standards. Show them how and why their work matters. Reward them for their success."* When leaders hold themselves accountable at par with team and show them that their work matters they act as a transformational leader. On the other hand, when leaders reward the followers for their success, they are transformational leader.